Comparison of Direct Instruction Learning Model and Cooperative Learning Model on Floor Gymnastics Learning Outcomes

M. Taufiqurrahman. M[1]*, Mikkey Anggara Suganda[2], Adiman[3]

[1,2,3]Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Cirebon. Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Putri Dwi Hapsari, e-mail: opikswallow@gmail.Com

Abstract

Study purpose. The results of this experimental study can increase students motivation to learn physical education. The learning outcomes of students before and after being given treatment by applying the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model to the learning outcomes of floor exercises.

Materials and methods. The research method used in this study was experimental. Regarding the improvement in learning outcomes before and after applying the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model to floor gymnastics learning outcomes, it can be seen that in the pre-test, which was conducted before applying the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model to floor gymnastics learning outcomes, the average student learning score was 59 out of a maximum score of 71.

Results. From the categorisation results, it can be shown that there were 1 student or 2.8% in the very low category, 29 students or 80.6% in the low category, 6 students or 16.7% in the medium category, and no students in the high and very high categories. Based on the categorisation results, it can be stated that the students' learning outcomes were low. This can be seen in the percentage value, which was highest in the low category because the class average score was only 64.81 out of a total of 36 students.

Conclusion. Therefore, it can be concluded that the learning outcomes for floor exercises are homogeneous. Thus, the research hypothesis was tested using parametric statistics, namely the two-sample t-test and the paired t-test. These results also show that students who participated in direct instruction and cooperative learning models achieved good learning outcomes for floor exercises.

Keywords: Direct Instruction, Learning Outcomes, Cooperative Learning.

Introduction

Learning is a process of interaction between teachers and students, where teachers impart knowledge (transfer of knowledge) and students receive knowledge (reception of knowledge) from teachers. Teachers should create an active, innovative, communicative, effective and enjoyable learning environment (PAKEM), which is both fun and meaningful

(UNU Thesis 2022). Thus, the material presented by the teacher will be easily understood by students. More deeply, in Physical Education or PJOK subjects and even more deeply in Gymnastics material, a teacher will direct their students to learn how to do gymnastics properly and correctly according to the teacher's instructions at school so that unwanted things (injuries) do not occur. Observations can be conducted in the classroom by presenting the theory of proper gymnastics and taking students outside to practise it on the field. The aim is for students to understand the gymnastics material both in the classroom and on the field, both in terms of theory and direct practice, which will be carried out on 29 October 2023.

Physical Education and Sports in schools not only require repositioning, but also reorientation, re-actualisation and revitalisation of one of the subjects taught in physical education at SMAN 8 Kota Cirebon, namely that students are required to actively participate in learning, but there are still some who do not meet the learning requirements both in and outside the classroom in gymnastics. Therefore, it is necessary to compare the Direct Instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model in terms of their concepts and management in order to find the most suitable place for them in physical education learning. Furthermore, the problem that exists in the learning process at school is that there are still many students who are unable to understand the basic forward roll movement using their head and feet.

The objectives of this study are as follows: To determine the learning outcomes before using the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model. To determine the learning outcomes after using the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model.

Materials and Methods

The research utilised research techniques involving observation, questionnaires, documentation, and interviews. According to Sugiyono (2014:145), 'observation is a complex process, a process composed of various biological and psychological processes'.

The learning model used is Direct Instruction, which is a discipline that clearly relies on the thinking process and is considered very good for teaching students. It contains various aspects that substantially guide students to think logically according to patterns and rules that have been structured properly and correctly. The Direct Instruction learning model requires lecturers to teach basic skills directly and demonstrate them to students in a structured manner. Understanding Cooperative Learning The cooperative learning model can be applied to motivate students to express their opinions, respect the opinions of others, and exchange ideas. In addition, in learning, students usually. Cooperative means working together to achieve a common goal. The term cooperative learning comes from the English term 'Cooperative Learning'. In an English-Indonesian dictionary, cooperative means collaboration and learning means knowledge or lessons. As it relates to the teaching and learning process, the term Cooperative Learning is interpreted as cooperative learning. The objectives of the cooperative learning model are to improve students' academic achievement and enable them to accept diversity among their peers, as well as to develop social skills (Surur, M., 2020).

Results and discussion

Learning Outcomes of Grade XI IPS 2 Students Before Comparing the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model on Floor Gymnastics Learning Outcomes. Based on data collected by the researcher through a test instrument (pre-test) during the research conducted by the researcher at State Senior High School 8 in Cirebon City on social studies learning outcomes before the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model on floor gymnastics learning outcomes, the description of the students' pre-test scores before the treatment was given is presented in Table 1 below:

.

Table 1. Description of Pre-test Scores of Students at State Senior High School 8, Cirebon City

Statistics	Statistical Values
Sample Size	36
Highest Student Score	71
Lowest Student Score	59
Maximum Score	100
Score Range	50
Average Student Score	64,81

From Table 1, we can see that the average learning score of 36 students on the pre-test was 64.81 out of a maximum score of 100. The highest score achieved by a student was 71 and the lowest score was 59, with a score range of 50. If categorised according to the Ministry of Education and Culture guidelines, the students' learning outcomes can be seen as follows:

Table 2. Categories of Student Learning Outcomes Before the Implementation of the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model

Interval	Frekuensi	Presentase	Category
0 –59	1	2,8%	Very Low
60-69	29	80,6%	Low
70-79	6	16,7%	Moderate
80-89	-	-	High
90-100	-	-	Very High
Amount	36	100%	

Based on the categorisation results in the Ministry of Education and Culture guidelines, it can be concluded that student learning outcomes prior to the Direct Instruction Learning Model and Cooperative Learning Model were categorised as low. This can be seen in the largest percentage being in the low category, namely 80.6% or 29 students who received low scores, in the very low category, namely 2.8% or 1 student, while there were no students who achieved the high and very high categories. 2. Learning Outcomes of Grade XI Social Studies 2 Students After Comparing the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model on Floor Gymnastics Learning Outcomes.

In this section, the author will analyse the learning outcome data of Grade XI students collected through a post-test instrument administered in Social Studies lessons using the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model in the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Furthermore, to determine the description of the students' post-test scores after the treatment, the following table is presented:

Table 3. Description of Post-test Scores of Students at State Senior High School 8

Statistics	Statistical Values
Sample Size	36
Highest Student Score	89
Lowest Student Score	78
Maximum Score	100
Score Range	50
Average Student Score	81,94

.

From Table 3, we can see that the average learning score of 36 students after being given treatment in the form of Direct Instruction and Cooperative Learning Models, which were then followed by a post-test, was 81.94 out of a maximum score of 100. The highest score that students could achieve was 89 and the lowest was 78, with a score range of 50. If categorised according to the Ministry of Education and Culture guidelines, the students' learning outcomes can be seen as follows:

Table 4. Categories of Student Learning Outcomes After the Application of the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model

Interval	Frekuensi	Presentase	Category
0 – 59	-	-	Very Low
60-69	-	-	Low
70-79	6	16,7	Moderate
80-89	30	83,3	High
90 – 100	-	-	Very High
Jumlah	36	100%	

Based on the categorisation results using the Ministry of Education and Culture guidelines, we can conclude that after implementing the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model, student learning outcomes have improved. This is evident in the highest percentage being in the high category, with 83.3% or 30 students achieving the high category, while 16.7% or 6 students achieved the medium category. No students achieved the very low, low, or very high categories.

Conclusion

The learning outcomes before using the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model were that the average learning score of 36 students on the pre-test was 64.81 out of a maximum score of 100. The highest score achieved by students was 71 and the lowest score was 59, with a score range of 50, which was categorised as low. This can be seen in the percentage of students in the low category, which was 80.6% or 29 students who received low scores, while 2.8% or 1 student was in the very low category. No students achieved the high or very high categories. 2. The learning outcomes after using the direct instruction learning model and the cooperative learning model were the average learning scores of 36 students after being given treatment in the form of the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model, which were then given a post-test, which was 81.94 out of a maximum score of 100. The highest score that students could obtain was 89 and the lowest score was 78, with a score range of 50. After the implementation of the Direct Instruction Learning Model and the Cooperative Learning Model, student learning outcomes improved. This can be seen in the largest percentage being in the high category, namely 83.3% or 30 students who achieved the high category, while 16.7% or 6 students were in the medium category, and no students achieved the very low, low, or very high categories.

References

Agus Suprijono, Cooperatif Learning Teori dan Aplikasi PAIKEM, (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2010), hlm. 54.

Anita, lie. 2008. Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas. Jakarta: Grasindo

Chandra, S. (2010). Pendidikan Jasmani Olahraga dan Kesehatan untuk SMP/MTs Kelas VII. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan, Kementrian Pendidikan Nasional.

.

Dian Novianti Sitompul Program Studi Pendidikan Akuntansi Fakultas Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan (2021) dengan judul Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Direct Instruction Berbasis Games Terhadap Minat Belajar Mahasiswa Pada Mata Kuliah Akuntansi Pasiva Program Studi Pendidikan Akuntansi Fkip Umsu. UMSU Email : diannoviantisitompul@umsu.ac.id Isra Hayati Program Studi Perbankan Syariah Fakultas Agama Islam UMSU Email : israhayati@umsu.ac.id.

Etin Solihatin dan Raharjo, Cooperatif Learning Analisis Model Pembelajaran IPS, (Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara, 2008), hlm. 4.

Harefa, Murnihati Sarumaha, Amaano Fau, Tatema Telambanua, Fatolosa Hulu, Kaminudin Telaumbanua, Indah Permata Sari Lase, Mastawati Ndruru , Lies Dian Marsa Ndraha (2021) dengan judul Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw Terhadap Kemampuan Pemahaman Konsep Belajar Siswa DarmawanDosen Universitas Nias Raya.

Lie, A. (2002). Coopeative Learning.Jakarta: Grasindo

Martinis Yamin dan Bansu I (2008) Ansari, Teknik Mengembangkan Kemampuan Individual Siswa.

Mashudi, Desain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif Berbasis Konstruktivisme, (Tulungagung:STAIN Tulungagung Press, 2013), 47.

McGinnis, P. M. (2005). Biomechanics of Sport and Exercise, 2nd Edition (2nd ed.). United Kingdom: Human Kinetics

Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-progresif: Konsep Landasan Dan Implementasinya Pada KTSP, hlm. 61.

Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-progresif: Konsep Landasan Dan Implementasinya Pada KTSP, hlm. 60. 15 Agus Suprijono, Cooperatif Learning Teori dan Aplikasi PAIKEM, hlm. 61.

Milcic, L., Markovic, K. Z., & AleksicVeljkovic, A. (2017). One Way Proceeding Of Learning Basic Gymnastic Elements. Proceedings Of The 11th International Conference On Kinanthropology: Sport And Quality Of Life (Ick 2017).

Muhajir. (2006). Pendidikan Jasmani Teori Dan Praktek1. Jakarta: Erlangga

Ni'matul. Khoeriyah, (2016) degan Judul Pengaruh Model Dirct Instruction Terhadap Hasil Belajar SBK Materi Membuat Karya Kolase Siswa Kelas IV SDN Gugus Kenanga Kabupaten Kebumen, (Semarang : Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2016), 44.

Paul. Eggen, Don. Kauchak, Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran, (Jakarta Barat : Indeks, 2012), 363.

Saminan, Strategi Belajar Mengajar, (Banda Aceh: Universitas Syiah Kuala, 2006), h. 102

Sanjaya, W. (2007). Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Sumber Proses Pendidikan. Jakarta: Kencana.

Information about the authors:

M. Taufiqurrahman. M,: taufik@gmail.com, Pendidikan Jasmani Kesehatan dan Rekreasi, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Cirebon, Indonesia.

Mikkey Anggara Suganda,.: mikkey-anggara-suganda@unucirebon.ac.id, Pendidikan Jasmani Kesehatan dan Rekreasi, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Cirebon, Indonesia.

Adiman,.: adiman@gmail.com, Pendidikan Jasmani Kesehatan dan Rekreasi, Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Cirebon, Indonesia.